

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KEITH BEAUCHAMP,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

PAUL SUMNIGHT, BELINDA
SCHRUBBE and KENNETH ADLER,

11-cv-347-wmc

Defendants.

Plaintiff Keith Beauchamp is proceeding in this case on his claim that defendants Paul Sumnicht, Belinda Schrubbe and Kenneth Adler were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Now before the court are plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel. *See* dkts. 11 and 16.

As a starting point, this court would appoint a lawyer to almost every pro se plaintiff if lawyers were available to take these cases. But they are not. Most lawyers do not have the time, the background or the willingness to represent pro se plaintiffs in a pro bono capacity, and this court cannot make them. So the court only appoints counsel in cases where there is a demonstrated need, using the appropriate legal test.

In deciding whether to appoint counsel, I must first find that plaintiff has made a reasonable effort to find a lawyer on his own and has been unsuccessful or that he has been prevented from making such an effort. *Jackson v. County of McLean*, 953 F.2d 1070 (7th Cir. 1992). To show that he has made reasonable efforts to find a lawyer, plaintiff must give the court the names and addresses of at least three lawyers that he has asked to represent him in this case and who turned him down. Plaintiff has provided copies of letters from six lawyers who have declined to represent him.

Next, a district court must consider both the complexity of the case and the pro se plaintiff's ability to litigate it himself. *Pruitt v. Mote*, 503 F.3d 647, 654-55 (7th Cir. 2007). In his motion, plaintiff says that he is not well-versed in the law and that the legal issues in his case are complex. The fact that plaintiff is not well-versed in the law is not a reason to appoint counsel. This handicap is universal among pro se litigants. To help plaintiff in this regard, however, this court instructs pro se litigants at a preliminary pretrial conference, which will be scheduled as soon as defendants file a responsive pleading, about how to use discovery techniques available to all litigants so that he can gather the evidence he needs to prove his claim. In addition, pro se litigants are provided a copy of this court's procedures for filing or opposing dispositive motions and for calling witnesses, both of which were written for the very purpose of helping pro se litigants understand how these matters work.

With respect to the complexity of the case, nothing in the record suggests that it is factually or legally difficult. The law concerning plaintiff's claim was explained to him in the June 18, 2012 order. Plaintiff has personal knowledge of the circumstances surrounding his lawsuit. If he does not have copies of documents he needs to prove his claim, he can use discovery to obtain any additional information he needs to make his case.

In sum, I am not persuaded that plaintiff's case is so complex or his skills so lacking that appointment of counsel is warranted at this time. Therefore, plaintiff's motion will be denied without prejudice to plaintiff bringing it at a later stage in his lawsuit.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel, dkts. 11 and 16, are DENIED without prejudice.

Entered this 13th day of July, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge